

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DR. MANHUA MANDY LIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY
d/b/a DOW ADVANCED MATERIALS,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 11-3158

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th day of March, 2012, upon careful consideration of defendant Rohm and Haas Company's motion to dismiss plaintiff Dr. Manhua Mandy Lin's complaint (document no. 10), Dr. Lin's opposition thereto, and Rohm and Haas's reply, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART** as follows:

1. Rohm and Haas's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** as to count I, alleging retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, but only insofar as the retaliation claims are based on the 2003 discovery requests. The motion is **DENIED** as to count I with respect to retaliation claims arising out of subsequent events.

2. Rohm and Haas's motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** as to count II, alleging retaliation in violation of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, but only insofar as the retaliation claims are based on the 2003 discovery requests. The motion is **DENIED** as to count II with respect to retaliation claims arising out of subsequent events.

3. Rohm and Haas's motion to dismiss is **DENIED** as to count III, alleging breach of

contract.

4. Rohm and Haas's motion to dismiss is **DENIED** as to count IV, alleging intentional interference with prospective contractual relations.

/s/William H. Yohn Jr.

William H. Yohn Jr., Judge